UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,313	12/23/2003	Hye-won Yang	Q79032	5574

23373 7590 07/27/2007

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
THERIAULT, STEVEN B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/743,313	YANG, HYE-WON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven B. Theriault	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 April 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 04/30/2007.

This action is made Final. Applicant's amendment has changed the scope of the claim and therefore necessitated the final.

2. Claims 1 -9 are pending in the case. Claims 1, and 5 are the independent claims.

Drawings

3. The previous objection to the drawings is now moot as the specification has been amended to include the missing numbers and the drawings have been accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 5-6, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hinegardner et al. (hereinafter Hinegardner) U.S. Patent No. 6,803,929 issued Oct 12, 2004 and filed July 5, 2001.**

In regard to **Independent claim 5,** Hinegardner teaches a method of executing a multi-clipboard, the method comprising:

- Determining whether a predetermined amount of time has passed after a paste menu is activated (Hinegardner column 4, lines 1-10 and column 8, lines 40-50)
- Pasting data stored in a basic clipboard if a signal indicating a user's selection to the paste menu is received before the predetermined amount of time has passed (column 4,

lines 1-10, and Column 8, lines 40-45) Hinegardner teaches the pasting of the information to the clipboard at a time specified by the user.

- Displaying data stored in a multi-clipboard if the predetermined amount of time has passed (See figure 9 and column 4, lines 35-41) Hinegardner shows multiple items in the clipboard are displayed where the user sequence to copy the information to the clipboard occurs after an interval.

With respect to **dependent claim 6,** Hinegardner teaches the method wherein the method further comprises a user input indicating a user's selection of one item of the displayed data is received, pasting the selected item of the displayed data (column 8, lines 9-48).

With respect to **dependent claim 8,** Hinegardner teaches the method wherein step (c) further comprises arranging the data stored in the multi-clipboard in the same order that each item of the data is stored (Figure 10).

With respect to **dependent claim 9,** Hinegardner teaches the method wherein the method further comprises (e) pasting the data stored in the basic clipboard by using paste softkeys (column 8, lines 40-50)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinegardner et al. (hereinafter Hinegardner) U.S. Patent No. 6,803,929 issued Oct 12, 2004 and filed July 5, 2001, in view of Goldstein et al (hereinafter Goldstein) U.S. Publication No 20020143985 published Oct 3, 2002.**

In regard to **Independent claim 1,** Hinegardner teaches an apparatus for executing a multi-clipboard, the apparatus comprising:

- A basic clipboard and a multi-clipboard in which data is stored by implementing a copy or cut operation (Hinegardner column 4,lines 1-11 and Figures 1-10). Hinegardner teaches a queue that can comprise a single item and multiple items and is displayed as cards in a deck. Hinegardner teaches the queue is a clipboard (See column 6, lines 53-54). A copy and cut operation along with paste can be performed.
- A timer which counts an amount of time after a paste menu is activated (Hinegardner column 4, lines 1-11 and 35-41) Hinegardner discloses a timer that tracks the time interval of user input before performing an operation.
- A basic clipboard executing unit which pastes the data stored in the basic clipboard if the paste menu is selected **before** the amount of time counted by the timer **is not greater** than a predetermined amount of time (Hinegardner column 4, lines 1-11 and 35-41) Hinegardner teaches the operation is performed at an interval set by the user which can be before a predetermined amount of time. Hinegardner shows a system that makes a determination both on time and if items are already in the queue. Nonetheless, each item in the queue is represented as a single card or clipboard.
- A multi-clipboard executing unit which displays the data stored in the multi-clipboard if the paste menu is selected after the amount of time counted by the timer is greater than the predetermined amount of time (Hinegardner column 5, lines 45-60 and column 6,lines 45-54 and column 8, lines 20-60) Hinegardner shows (See figure 9) where multiple items are

placed on a clipboard after a user has performed a user action sequence and a time interval has been exceeded.

Hinegardner does not expressly teach:

- A basic clipboard executing unit which pastes the data stored in the basic clipboard if the paste menu is selected **before** the amount of time counted by the timer **is greater** than a predetermined amount of time

Hinegardner suggests that the first action sequence of a user selecting a file with an input device and then holding the mouse button down for an interval for 3 seconds executes the command of paste after the interval expires. However, in the passage (column 4, lines 5-10) Hinegardner suggests that the interval can be set to some other minimum time interval and the skilled artisan would determine that the interval could be zero or to any other interval, the user desires. If the interval were zero then the response would be automatic. Hinegardner also teaches that a key can be pressed after a pointing event without a time interval attached, which is a second suggestion of automatic operation. Nonetheless, the teachings of Hinegardner are not specifically clear that even though the interval can be set to possibly zero, the counter time is not mentioned as being checked to make a determination. Goldstein teaches a clipboard that executes a timer when a series of keystrokes are executed to determine the time elapsed between strokes that could be between the select and the paste command. The elapsed time, as counted by a counter, is checked to see if the selection is performed between the predetermined limit and the selection, which would provide for a process of selecting, after making a comparison to a counted time, prior to the time exceeding an interval. Hinegardner teaches the purpose of the interval is to distinguish the input event from normal input events (See column 4, lines 29-40) such as the left and right button menus normally associated with file manager commands. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Hinegardner and Goldstein in front of them, to modify the system of Hinegardner to include a feature to copy the contents of the selected item to the clipboard prior to the user

exceeding a predetermined time interval between command inputs. The motivation to combine the teachings comes from the suggestion in Goldstein that the process of using predefined keystrokes to execute the users desires to copy, cut and paste using a memory buffer while tracking the time interval between the strokes is well known in the art (See page 2, Para 0020). Further, Goldstein teaches that there are various techniques for recognizing time-limited keystroke sequences in the art, where a microcontroller can be employed to recognize the keystroke and calculating the time elapsed between strokes (See Para 0022, bottom).

Moreover, Goldstein is a specific example of the alternative embodiments presented in Hinegardner where keystrokes combines with time intervals are contemplated (See column 8, lines 35-49).

With respect to **dependent claim 2,** Hinegardner teaches the apparatus herein, if a user input indicating a user's selection of one item of the displayed data is received, the multi-clipboard executing unit pastes the selected item of the displayed data (column 8, lines 9-48).

With respect to **dependent claim 3,** Hinegardner teaches the apparatus wherein the multi-clipboard executing unit displays the data stored in the multi-clipboard in an order in which the data is stored (Figure 10) Hinegardner shows the files displayed in order 1, 2, 3.

8. **Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinegardner et al. (hereinafter Hinegardner) U.S. Patent No. 6,803,929 issued Oct 12, 2004 and filed July 5, 2001 in view of Goldstein et al (hereinafter Goldstein) U.S. Publication No 20020143985**

published Oct 3, 2002, in further view of Martinez et al. (hereinafter Martinez) U.S. Publication 2003/0076364 published Apr. 24, 2003 and filed Oct. 18, 2001.

With respect to **dependent claims 4 and 7,** as indicated in the above discussion Hinegardner in view of Goldstein teaches every limitation of claims 1 and 5.

Hinegardner in view of Goldstein does not expressly disclose where the apparatus wherein the latest copied or cut data is stored in the basic clipboard.

Martinez teaches a clipboard where the last pasted information is displayed in the clipboard that can be considered a basis clipboard for single items (See Para 0020). Hinegardner and Martinez are analogous art because they both teach processes of manipulating and managing information and processes of cutting, copying and pasting and retrieving information from system clipboards.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Goldstein, Hinegardner and Martinez in front of them, to modify the system of Hinegardner to display the last entered item in the clipboard to the user. The motivation to combine Hinegardner and Goldstein with Martinez comes from the expressed suggestion in Martinez of performing operations on a clipboard once the user has performed a function and to display to the user the information within the clipboard via a popup where the indication is displayed to the user that the last item copied is shown.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re *Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re *Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 04/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument for claim 5

Applicant argues in claim 1 the Hinegardner does not teach a process of pasting information to a specific clipboard prior to a predetermine interval after a keystroke because the applicant argues that Hinegardner teaches pasting after the interval (See argument Page 7, Top). Claim 1 has been amended and applicant argues that claim 5 recites features analogous to claim 1 and therefore the same argument applies.

The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner considers the argued limitations of claim 1 and claim 5 different in scope. For example, the argued claim 1 limitation contains:

- A basic clipboard executing unit which pastes the data stored in the basic clipboard if the paste menu is selected **before** the amount of time counted by the timer **is greater** than a predetermined amount of time

The argued limitation of claim 5, contains:

- Pasting data stored in a basic clipboard if a signal indicating a user's selection to the paste menu is received before the predetermined amount of time has passed

Claim 1 makes a comparison to a counted amount of time by the timer to see if a predetermined amount of time has passed while claim 5 only makes a comparison to see if the time has passed. Therefore, based on the subtle yet distinct difference in claim 1 and 5, the Examiner maintains the 102 rejection over Hinegardner because Hinegardner teaches the user can set the time interval to a time they see fit (See column 4, lines 5-10) and Hinegardner teaches a process where a specific keystroke could be used copy via a keystroke without making a comparison to time (See column 8, lines 40-45). If the user can perform the action sequence by pointing and then selecting a keystroke then the command is automatically executed, without a wait and before and predetermined time has passed. The scenario can be as follows, the system can be setup so that the user can perform a paste function to the clipboard by A) pointing at the file and then hitting a specific keystroke so that the command happens instantaneously. B) The user can

select the file, hold the mouse for an interval and then the after the interval has passed then the system will paste the file to a clipboard, as taught by Hinegardner.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SBT

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER